REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 4, 11-14, 16, and 23-26 are amended and new claims 28-49 are added. No new matter is presented, and accordingly approval and entry of the foregoing amended and added claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 10-18, and 22-49 are pending and under consideration.

As set forth below, it is submitted that these claims clearly patentably distinguish over the art of record.

BACKGROUND

An interview with the Examiner was conducted on September 9, 2003, and a Preliminary Amendment amending claims as agreed at the interview was filed on September 22, 2003.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 1, 13, and 25 are amended to recite that --storing the reduced screen information is to store a part of the screen information and not to store another part of the screen information--. Claims 4 and 16 are amended to recite that --outputting the reduced screen information is to output a part of the screen information and not to store another part of the screen information--. For example, page 20, starting at line 5 describes the reduced screen information.

Claims 2, 14, and 26 are amended to recite that --picture information input from a first device is stored at the storage device in order to record and the stored picture information is outputted in order to reproduce--. For example, as shown in FIG 12 picture information is input from a first device through input terminal 220 and stored at the stored device 8. (See page 12-15, starting at line 4).

Claims 11-12 and 23- 24 are amended to recite that picture information stored at the storage device is --outputted to reproduce--. For example, as shown in FIG 12 picture information is output through output terminal 221 to reproduce. (See page 12-15, starting at line 18).

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims recite 27-34 recite that screen information is reduced by at least one of pixel reduction, line reduction, and frame reduction. (For example see pages 20-21, starting at line

22).

New claims recite 35-39 recite that that the inputted picture information displayable on a screen of a display device is not reduced both when the copy guard signal is not detected and when the detected copy guard signal indicates a copying restriction. (For example, page 21 starting at line 5 describing reduction).

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the new claims are respectfully requested.

ITEM 2: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3, 6, 10, 12-16, 18, 22, 24-27 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) BY OKAMOTO et al. (U.S.P. 5,627,655) IN VIEW OF ADACHI (U.S.P. 5,151,795)

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 13, and 25, the Action concedes that Okamoto fails to teach reducing information to deteriorate image quality. The Examiner contends however that Adachi teaches "compressing an image signal would necessarily deteriorate image quality," and that motivation exists to modify Okamoto.

Regarding the rejection of claims 2-3, 6, 10, 12, 14-16, 18, 22, 24, and 26-27, the Examiner contends that all features of the claims are present in a "combination of Okamoto et al. and Adachi." (Action at pages 3-5). The Examiner does not contend there is motivation to modify Okamoto.

Traverse

***Prima Facie* Obviousness Not Established**

Features Not Described In The Prior Art

As provided in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 1981, (CCPA 1974).

Storing Or Encoding Of Reduced Screen Information Not Taught

Claims 1 and 13 recite storing reduced screen information, and claims 10 and 22 recite encoding reduced screen information, including a case where the copy guard detecting circuit detects a copy guard signal indicating a copying restriction. These features are not described in the cited art. Any of the Examiner's citations to Okamoto only refer to a case when a signal indicates that copying is not restricted.

Separate Storage Device Not Taught

Claims 2, 14, and 26 (all as amended) recite that --picture information input from a first device is stored at the storage device in order to record and the stored picture information is outputted in order to reproduce--. Okamoto only describes a single divide a digital VTR (See,

col. 2, line 45). The method described in Adachi does not describe a device.

Storing of Detection of Copy Guard To Storage Device Not Taught

Claims 3, 15, and 27 recite storing to a storage device, both screen information digitized by said video decoding circuit and the fact of the detection by said copy guard detecting circuit of the copy guard signal. None of the cited art alone, or in combination teaches this feature.

No Motivation Or Reasonable Expectation of Success Stated Within the Cited Art To Combine In The Manner Proposed By The Examiner Or In Any Manner

As provided in MPEP §2143 entitled Basic Requirements of a *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness:

> The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant submits there is no incentive to modify the recording/reproducing apparatus for video signals described in Okamoto with any compression method for a set of image signals as described in Adachi, or for any other reason. Adachi only teaches a compression method that is applicable to image signals, not video signals, and further the image signals are restricted that, in order to implement the compression method as described (col. 3, lines 20-22) in Adachi:

> images of a single object are recorded simultaneously or sequentially at some time intervals, have a high correlation to one another.

Any compression method taught by Adachi is further restricted, for example:

> compressibility must be restricted such that the image quality of the reproduced image does not much [sic] deteriorate.

(See col. 1, lines 49-51).

In addition, the method of compression proposed in Adachi (for example, col. 2 starting at line 42) uses a "prediction encoding process" (col. 2, line 65).

Applicant submits there is no teaching in Okamoto to modify the described apparatus for video signals in a manner as taught by Adachi only applicable to image signals, let alone in such a restricted manner. In addition, Applicant submits that assuming *arguendo* that such a modification was attempted it would render Okamoto unsuitable for its purpose of recording video signals due, for example, to the requirement of the method taught by Adachi to have image of a single object.

Conclusion

Since *prima facie* obviousness has not been established, the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 10, 12-16, 18, 22, 24-27 should be withdrawn and claims 4-5, 11, 17, and 23 allowed.

ITEM 4: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4-5, 11, 17 AND 23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER OKAMOTO AND ADACHI IN VIEW OF KITAZAWA HIROAKI (P.N. 09083920)

The Action concedes that the combination of Okamoto and Adachi fails to teach:

> preventing the video encoding circuit form outputting the video signal in the case where an output of screen information stored in the storage device is ordered, and in the case where the information is protected from copying.

(Action at page 6). However, the Examiner contends that this is taught by Hiroaki and that there there is motivation to modify Okamoto and Adachi.

Traverse

***Prima Facie* Obviousness Not Established**

No Motivation Or Reasonable Expectation of Success Stated Within the Cited Art To Combine In The Manner Proposed By The Examiner

Applicant submits there is no showing of an incentive to modify the apparatus for copying contents of a recorded recording medium described in Okamoto or a method of compression for an image signal described in Adachi with Hiroaki's apparatus that processes a picture signal and printing it with a video printer as suggested by the Examiner or for any other reason.

Applicant submits that both Adachi and Kitazawa Hiroaki are nonanalogous art. Adachi only describes a method of compressing an image signal. Hiroaki discloses only a picture processor apparatus describing when a copy guard signal is detected printing out "characters to the recording part."

Applicant submits none of the art alone or in combination disclose an image processing apparatus recording screen information, as recited in Applicant's claims 4, 5, and 11 or a method for controlling image information, as recited in Applicant's claims 17 and 23, and is unrelated to the technique of the present invention as claimed therein.

Conclusion

Since *prima facie* obviousness has not been established, the rejection of claims 4-5, 11, 17 and 23 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

NEW CLAIMS 28-49

New claims recite 28-34 recite that screen information is reduced by at least one of pixel reduction, line reduction, and frame reduction. New claims 35-49 recite that the inputted picture information displayable on a screen of a display device is not reduced both when the copy guard

signal is not detected and when the detected copy guard signal indicates a copying restriction.

These, and other, features of claims 28-49 are patentably distinguishable from the cited art, and they are submitted to be allowable for the recitations therein.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding rejections have been overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that all claims patentably distinguish over the prior art, taken alone or in any proper combination. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 22, 2004

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, N.W. Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 434-1500